

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed May 29, 2008 has been received and the Examiner's comments carefully reviewed. Claims 8-18 are rejected. Claim 8 has been amended. For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections

Some claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In response to the Examiner's questions, the Applicants point the Examiner to the Applicants' specification describing Figure 3 that begins on page 12. The Applicants respectfully submit that a hardware ID can be generated many different ways and an example is provided on page 13. For example, page 13, lines 7-12 states that "A digit for a given system component can be derived in different ways, such as performing a modulo operation on a chunk of the BIOS, or on the hard disk drive's serial number. Table 1 shows an example construction of a 5-digit hardware ID, and how the digits are derived from the corresponding component." Page 14 illustrates another example of using a hardware ID. In addition to the above arguments, Claim 8 has been amended to more clearly define the use of the single computer ID being used to differentiate the installation of the product on one computer from an installation of the product on other computers. Applicants submit that these clarifications should resolve the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karp (U.S. Patent No. 4,866,769) and further in view of Leyda (U.S. Patent No. 5,867,730). Claims 9-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karp and Leyda and further in view of Subler (U.S. Patent No. 5,646,992), Kedeem (U.S. Patent No. 6,845,428), Bodo (U.S. Patent No. 6,480,925), Bondy et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,491,813) (hereinafter "Bondy"), Dapper et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0106060) (hereinafter "Dapper"), and Benson, IV et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,081,752) (hereinafter "Benson").

With regard to Claim 8, the Office Action states that Karp teaches "a single computer system ID for identifying a computer system, wherein the single computer-system ID is stored on the computer system and is generated during the installation of a software product on the computer system, wherein the single computer system ID represents the computer system plurality of components and wherein the single computer system ID comprises a variable number of bits corresponding to the ability to differentiate multiple computer systems based on a particular component having a unique identifier, wherein the particular component is one of the plurality of components (abstract). Karp does not disclose the computer system comprising a plurality of components, each component having a unique identifier wherein the single computer system ID comprises a plurality of hardware device identifier portions each hardware device identifier portion associated with a single component of the computer system. Leyda discloses the computer system comprising a plurality of components, each component having a unique identifier wherein the single computer system ID comprises a concatenation of the plurality of hardware device identifier portions each hardware device identifier portion associated with a single component of the computer system (abstract; col.6, 35-54). It would have been obvious to

modify Karp to include the computer system comprising a plurality of components, each component having a unique identifier wherein the single computer system ID comprises a plurality of hardware device identifier portions each hardware device identifier portion associated with a single component of the computer system such as that taught by Leyda in order to have a system and method to aid in the installation and/or reinstallation of computer software in a simplified and automated manner (Leyda, col.1, 48-53).” While the Applicants disagree, Claim 8 has been amended to more clearly define the invention and move the prosecution of this case forward.

As amended, Claim 8 recites “A single computer system identifier (ID) for identifying a computer system, the single computer system ID being comprised of a concatenation of a plurality of hardware device identifier portions, the computer system comprising a plurality of components, each component having a unique identifier, wherein the single computer-system ID is stored on the computer system after being generated during the installation of a software product on the computer system, wherein the single computer system ID comprises the concatenation of the plurality of hardware device identifier portions during the installation of the software product on the computer system, each hardware device identifier portion associated with a single component of the computer system wherein the single computer system ID represents the computer system plurality of components and wherein the single computer system ID comprises a variable number of bits; wherein the single computer system ID differentiates the computer system from other computer systems based on a particular component having a unique identifier, wherein the particular component is one of the plurality of components.” Among

other differences, the cited references do not teach generating the single computer system identifier during installation of the software product.

The ID in Karp is not generated during the installation of a software product. Instead, the ID represents a pre-existing value stored in the computer before the software is installed. Thus, Karp fails to teach or suggest even a possibility that the ID is generated during installation of a software product on the computer system. The addition of Leyda to Karp fails to teach the recitations found within Claim 8. The abstract of Leyda recites in part “In response to the query instructions, the CD-ROM drive replies with data that can be used to uniquely identify the model number or type of CD-ROM drive. The system then selects the appropriate software driver for the identified CD-ROM drive and loads the selected driver.” Leyda is using the query to identify the correct model number of a device such that a device driver can be selected. Leyda makes no teaching or suggestion to concatenate a plurality of hardware device identifier portions during the installation of a software product. Because Karp and Leyda, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest any of these limitations, the references fail to support a *prima facie* obviousness rejection. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn against claim 8. Additionally, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to point out with specificity where these recitations can be found within the cited references. The Office Action stated that the previous arguments were not persuasive but did not provide any statements as to where these recitations within the claims can be found. As such, the Applicants respectfully request that the next action be a non-final action if the Examiner does not find the application to be in condition for allowance.


Claims 9-18 are proposed to be allowable as they depend on a valid base claim and the cited references fail to teach the recitations found within the claims.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all pending claims are believed to be allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further issues regarding this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the applicants at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.



Timothy P. Sullivan
Registration No. 47,981
Direct Dial: 206.342.6254

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P. O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
206.342.6200

27488 PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE
